

Have you figured out this?

I want to help other countries.

Have you figured out this?

Mr. Speaker, unless you are willing to work on the reality of here is what is about to happen to us because these are our demographics, are you going to adopt policies from immigration to the Tax Code to technology, everything that grows like crazy in this Nation and then are you going to take on the cartels that cost us so much money?

Are you going to actually build a world where we crash the price of healthcare because we use technology and we cured diseases?

Some of that maybe you tell him that we don't have a choice.

For everyone else who says: I just want my money back, if you are someone out there who will say to Social Security and Medicare: Just give me my money back, then we will take that deal in a second.

Now, people forget Social Security is progressive. If you are a lower-income worker and you work your 40 quarters, then you get actually quite a spiff on the taxes you paid.

If you are a higher-income worker on Social Security and you had your 40 quarters, then you actually get less than what you actually paid in.

If you do the mean of the average couple on Social Security, you will have paid in about \$625,000 in taxes over your 40 quarters, and you are going to get back \$698,000.

Mr. Speaker, you would have made a hell of a lot more money if you had been allowed to take a portion of that and put it in the markets. President Bush tried doing that. He got the crap kicked out of him by the left.

So fine. You are poorer today, but for the average American you get your money back. You get a little spiff on Social Security.

The primary driver of those debt numbers is this right here. That average couple would have put \$161,000 over that lifetime of work into Medicare.

Understand, the Medicare taxes you pay, Mr. Speaker, the Medicare Trust Fund is the part A. Three-quarters of Medicare actually comes right out of the general fund. We expect that number to go up fairly dramatically in the next set of calculations. It is this gap right here that is the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt.

Mr. Speaker, at some point here we find out that just telling the truth actually gets you in trouble because I can tell you, my brothers and sisters here are really smart. They are truly experts in different things. And I swear they run away from me in the hallway when they see me carrying my charts saying, DAVID, I don't want to know, because if I tell my constituents that, then they get mad at me for telling them the truth.

□ 1915

Every day we wait, these numbers get worse; and yet, at the State of the Union they were saying, oh, everything

is fine, we are doing great. At one level, that is immoral because this is coming. Remember, 10 years from now is not long. These are lifetime charts. It is fixable.

For people to say, well, just get rid of all that other stuff of mandatory spending except for my earned benefits. Okay, maybe we should. But the chart, this is Social Security, this is the other mandatory, this is mostly healthcare, parts of this is actually Medicaid.

You start looking at, this is nutrition support, EITC, Social Security supplemental income, but you start to see everything else that is in mandatory is pretty darn small. Now, it doesn't mean some of these shouldn't be looked at and reformed or be put back on budget, but you see, it is these two programs. It is Social Security and healthcare that are almost everything.

I am absolutely committed. I am going to keep my promises. I am going to have this country keep its promises; but the only way we will do that is this body, this campus, every smart staffer around here, every lobbyist who walks in our doors who has a soul, bathe in the math. Let's get creative, let's promote economic growth in every lever we can. Let's legalize technology, let's legalize disruption and disrupt the price of delivering healthcare. It can be done.

Dear God, I have a 7-month-old. Doesn't he deserve a future?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICA NEEDS SOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona being down here talking about the trajectory this Nation finds itself on with respect to all spending, but in particular mandatory spending as we call it, and the need for all of us to get serious about doing something about it.

We sat here in this Chamber last night. The President of the United States did what you do in a campaign speech, not in the State of the Union. He did what you do when you have a failed agenda and you want to try to scare the American people rather than inspire the American people: Accuse your opponents of being against Social Security and Medicare with no real backing, but offering no solutions himself to the very problems articulated by the gentleman from Arizona.

Did anybody hear the President of the United States last night address at all the reality that Social Security and Medicare are on a path to bankruptcy in terms of their funding relative to the demands to pay benefits? Of course not. Of course not. Because the President of the United States, Joe Biden, has zero solutions to the problems facing this country. Not one.

Not one solution last night was offered. Standing at the well where the Speaker currently sits, not one solution was offered. Instead, it was a campaign speech.

The fact is, the American people, I think, saw through it because in the same speech that the President attacked Republicans for not having a solution for Social Security and Medicare, accusing Republicans of saying we were going to walk away from the obligations for Social Security and Medicare, the President offered no solutions on the border. None.

The President said not a word about our men and women in uniform. The President referenced Ukraine but didn't provide an actual strategy or desired outcome besides "Putin bad, Ukraine good."

Look, the fact of the matter is, the entire Nation is tired of exactly what we saw last night. Tired of it. The President came in and tried to offer populist rhetoric. Frankly, stealing some of the rhetoric almost directly from President Trump.

He tried to offer some old school Democrat rhetoric, saying, we have got a program for everybody in America. Don't worry, we are going to pay for it. I gave a speech on the floor of the House about a year ago entitled the United States House of free stuff about this body. A number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came down and talked about all of the student loans that would be forgiven, all of the spending that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would offer with no indication of how it would be paid for because why would you do that?

Look, the fact of the matter is, this body, the people's House, is never going to be serious about representing the people until we stop spending money we don't have, stop allowing for the printing of money to carry out the very things the American people sent us here to stop doing, stop funding the very bureaucracy that are carrying out the actions that we decry in our own campaigns. We are never going to get this country on track until we stop printing money, borrowing money, and spending money we don't have.

I would defy any one of my colleagues, anyone this side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle to come prove that statement wrong.

When we are \$32 trillion in debt, or almost, and we keep having a debate about who is going to spend more money on which program of our choice, how is that going to save the country?

With all due respect to colleagues on my side of the aisle, I have heard numerous Republicans say, "We are not going to touch defense spending." Okay. Good for you. Maybe I agree. Maybe we shouldn't touch defense spending. Maybe we need more defense spending to beat China.

But then what, pray tell, is your solution to fund it? I promise you—look, I request all my Republican colleagues

out there, come on down. If you are the one saying you will not touch defense spending, you come down here and you give me a solution. Don't hide behind the men and women in uniform. Don't go, oh, no, we are not going to touch defense spending, we need more defense spending, we need to beat China.

I might agree with you, but I am not going to sell printing and borrowing money that undermines the very national security that you are going out and talking about.

To my Democrat colleagues, you come down here, don't say a word about how you are going to pay for any of the spending, any of the programs that you stood up and applauded last night when the President of the United States was talking about it.

You say you want to have nondefense spending; you want to have more funding for HUD, more funding for HHS, more funding for programs, more funding for some cop grants or whatever it is. It wouldn't be for cop grants. You want more funding.

How are you going to pay for it? The answer is, no one is going to come down here and give an answer to that with the possible exception of two things. My Democratic colleagues will come down and say taxes. Okay. Come down, let's have a conversation about taxes. Come down and show me what taxes you want to raise that will not cause economic impact such that our revenues actually go down. Come show that to me. Let's have a debate about that.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle will tend to say, well, it is the mandatory spending, don't you understand? Don't worry about discretionary spending, that is small ball. Well, a third of our budget is discretionary spending still, so I am not sure that is small ball. I mean, it is, after all, \$1.6 trillion. I don't consider that small ball.

My colleagues aren't incorrect that we have got to deal with mandatory spending, but you can't hide behind mandatory spending, say that is the problem, while you then say, whoa, we have got to increase defense spending, and, well, I don't know that I would increase all that other nondefense spending, all those agencies, but you know what? That is what my Democrat colleagues want, so the only way I can get my defense spending is to agree to what they want, and one day we will deal with mandatory spending. What the hell, \$32 trillion of debt and counting.

That is exactly what happens. And, again, to any of my colleagues, come down here and prove me wrong. Come on down. I am here. Come debate me. The American people actually want to have a debate. Maybe we should have that debate every day, all day, until we come to some conclusion about how we are going to stop doing the same thing over and over again. Stop spending money we don't have.

Now, I will tell you my solution. I actually believe you should come to the

floor and come here to debate and have solutions. I believe that the bureaucracy of the Federal Government is plenty big. I don't believe it needs to get any bigger.

Call me crazy, but I think maybe returning the bureaucratic state, the administrative state, the bureaucracy, the Federal Government bureaucracy, returning it to preCOVID levels—I am not asking for that much. I am just saying, let's go back to the size of the bureaucracy before COVID spending blew the spending out of the water. That would be 2019 spending levels. Are you with me? Let's just take the bureaucracy, take it back to preCOVID spending levels.

Now, do that. Hold defense spending at 2023 levels that were just passed, that all the hawks were running around going, all right, we got more money for defense, we got a 10 percent increase in defense. Okay. Let's hold that spending. If you do what I just said, freeze the bureaucracy at 2019 levels, freeze defense spending at 2023 levels, the one we just passed, if you do that and you do that for 10 years, freeze that number for 10 years, you will save \$3.6 trillion and reduce our deficit spending. You will get about, I don't know, probably about a third of the way toward balancing the budget in 10 years. I think that is a pretty good start.

□ 1930

Does anybody in America want to raise their hand and say that the Federal bureaucracy in 2019 was too small? Does anybody want to come down and say: The size of the nondefense Federal Government in 2019, man, that government, oh, my gosh, it was so small. There were no bureaucrats interfering with my life. There were no regulations cutting off economic activity.

Again, come on down. Tell me how that government of 2019 just a few years ago was so efficient, so great, such a good size; that you think that is the right size and that we need it to be bigger; that it is not the right size and that we need it to be bigger.

I don't know many Americans—if I go to my district that I represent, 750,000 Texans, I don't know many of them that would raise their hand and go: Oh, please, I need that bureaucracy to be bigger. Hire more Federal workers into all of those programs. Fill up more buildings in Washington, D.C. We need more of that.

Defense spending, we just got defense spending increased a bit here in 2023. Well, you say, do we need more spending for defense? There are a lot of people who might say we might. Why? Well, is our Navy what it needs to be to beat China? Do we have all the latest technology that we need to be able to beat China or another world foe? Do we have all the latest and greatest intel? Do we have all the personnel trained properly at the levels we need to ensure that we can be the finest fighting force in the world and that we can kill

people and blow things up when necessary? That is what our military is supposed to do.

We might need more spending. I will grant that.

I will tell you what, take my plan of freezing the Federal bureaucracy, non-defense. Take last year's defense levels at 2023, and now increase it 2½ percent for the next 10 years. Instead of saving \$3.6 trillion, we would save \$3 trillion. It is still a pretty good step toward a 10-year balance.

That is one idea. I think it is the right idea. I will tell you why I think it is the right idea. I don't know why I want to give more money to an EPA that puts Joe Robertson in jail because he had water on his land and somehow that violated the waters of the United States laws.

I don't want to give more money to the bureaucrats at the Federal Bureau of Investigation to build a new \$400 million facility in Maryland like we just voted through in December, to hire more FBI agents to put more people like Scott Smith, a dad in Loudoun County, on a list to be a domestic terrorist because he dared to go to a school board and challenge a school board for not doing enough to protect his daughter.

Scott Smith joined me in this Chamber last night and sat right up there listening to the bloviating nonsense we heard coming from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue sitting here last night.

I don't want to give more money to those bureaucrats. I don't. I don't mind saying it.

I was a Federal prosecutor for a couple of years. The Department of Justice has plenty that it can cut. All I am talking about is going back to 2019 levels.

Do we want to fund NIH or FDA or CDC further to carry out more gain-of-function research? Anybody? Raise your hand. Raise your hand if you want more gain-of-function research coming out of your Federal labs, maybe even working with China to do it. Anybody sign up and say: Yes, that is a great idea. Good use of money. Well done. Does anybody want more of that, more of those programs, again, with borrowed printed money?

Do you want more money to go to the Department of Labor to shut down, for example, Rhea Lana Riner's children's clothing consignment company because she violated some standards, according to the Department of Labor?

How about more money for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to issue by regulation—not a law that we passed—a barring of pistol stabilizing braces that potentially make felons out of, I don't know, 10 million or more Americans? Does anybody want to give the ATF more money to go after and target the American people? That is what we do here.

With all due respect to my Republican colleagues who like to go take shots at my Democratic colleagues for

a lot of good reasons, by the way, it is not enough to campaign against this stuff and then come here and fund it. That is what we do. We campaign against these terrible regulations and these terrible actions by bureaucrats.

The IRS is going after nonprofits and faith-based organizations because of their beliefs. The FBI is targeting Mark Houck, a dad. The FBI showed up at 7 a.m. in the morning with a SWAT team to go after his family in Philadelphia because he dared to defend his son when they were outside of an abortion clinic engaging in their First Amendment right to stand up in defense of life. Oh, but let's go give some more money to them.

That is what we will do. Let's give more money to that bureaucracy, the woke, weaponized, wasteful bureaucracy at war with the American people, targeting the American people.

The truth is, we have an obligation to reduce Federal spending even if it were filled with nothing but angels doing nothing but angelic things because we are spending money we don't have. The truth is that bureaucracy is doing anything but those angelic things.

Why do we continue to fund it? The funding that we continue to provide for a bureaucracy that not only is at odds with and targeting the American people, targeting the Scott Smiths, targeting the Mark Houcks, targeting the Joe Robertsons for having water on his land, targeting Marvin Horne for his raisin crop, fining him \$685,000 because he didn't comply with certain New Deal-era restrictions that the Department of Agriculture put on him—think about that.

I am not saying that I can say every single thing that every example you bring up that someone didn't violate some reg or some rule because who the hell knows how many there are? I have asked. No one can tell me. How many Federal laws are there? Again, if any of my colleagues can come down here to the floor and bring me a footnoted cite and say this is how many Federal laws there are, I would love to see it. Come tell me how many regulations there are with laws and crimes attached.

According to one report I saw, there are an estimated 4,500 Federal laws, statutes, criminal statutes—sorry, not laws, criminal statutes—and some 300,000 crimes attached to regulations. That is just one report that I saw. The Department of Justice apparently tried to calculate this in the early 1980s, and they gave up. They came up with a certain number, and they just kind of stopped.

How can any American engage in activity and not essentially be violating something somewhere where some eager bureaucrat is just able to go: Nope. You are in violation. You are shut down.

We were sitting up in the Rules Committee the other day talking about vaccine mandates, and one of the witnesses testified. One of my colleagues

said: Well, why aren't you taking this end to the public health emergency or this end of the vaccine mandate through regular order?

Look, I am a big supporter of regular order. I think we should take things through committees and bring them to the floor and offer amendments. Let's keep in mind that is a one-page bill that is pretty straightforward, and I will just say this: What was the regular order carried out by the executive branch in just unilaterally executing an order to force vaccines upon private citizens through OSHA requirements—shut down by the courts, by the way. Where was the regular order? Where was the sort of equivalent to due process for the American people where we can at least go through and make some good decisions for the executive branch when they said: Yes, you military guys, you have to get this COVID vaccine.

Based on what? Well, Anthony Fauci said so. Rochelle Walensky said so.

Wait, but didn't CDC Director Walensky say that the vaccines don't do anything for transmission? Well, don't mind that. We will just keep mandating needles get stuck in the arms of our men and women in uniform, notwithstanding some of the concerns of myocarditis among the young, healthy population that predominantly make up our military, by the way.

Last night, my friend Senator CRUZ was sitting right over here during the State of the Union. He brought a young man, a member of our military who has been kicked off the career track. They are coming after him to get \$75,000 of money from schooling. They are coming after him. He has to write that check or they are going to keep coming after him. They have not fired him because of the bill that we passed in December saying we are not going to allow you to remove members of the military if they don't want to take the vaccine, but he is still being punished.

Right now, a patriot who signed up to serve his country has his government going after him for money that he has gotten for his family after his sacrifices to serve the country. They are going after him. His government is going after him when all he wanted to do was serve his country and not stick a needle in his arm because some bureaucrat said so.

Let me be perfectly clear to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: This is going to change. We are not going to do this. We are not going to allow the government to do this to the American people. I mean that.

When we fund the government this year, things better change, Mr. President. You come down here and make threats to us about what you think is going to happen with respect to default. You come down here and lecture us in the people's House. Well, let me tell you, Mr. President, we are a co-equal branch of government. We are not going to allow the American people to continue to be targeted by the very government that is supposed to protect

them, that is supposed to do their constitutional duty, that is supposed to secure the border of the United States, that is supposed to stop fentanyl from coming in, that is supposed to have operational control of the border so that neither Americans nor migrants are dying, that it is supposed to stop dangerous cartels, that is supposed to stand up to China, that is supposed to have a strong military sparingly used but not woke.

We are not supposed to spend money we don't have. We are supposed to balance our budget. We are supposed to defend the American people.

I am not going to agree, sitting in the Rules Committee or on this floor, to continue the process of spending money we don't have, of not changing the status quo, and not demanding that the President of the United States act like it, act like he is the President, defend this country, secure our border.

He doesn't get to come down here and lecture us. The people's House decides how dollars get spent. The people's House represents the people.

We need a reckoning. We need to stand up and fight, to stand up and be counted. I am not going to go around in the circles that we constantly go around in this place, having another meeting about another meeting about another meeting.

How about we just stand up for something? How about people be on the floor of this body debating? Get another hour of Special Orders, another half-hour of Special Orders.

□ 1945

I am sick and tired of watching my fellow Texans in the State legislature debating right now spending more Texas taxpayer money to do the job the Federal Government is supposed to do and secure the border.

I am sick and tired of walking around on eggshells around a body comprised of Members on both sides of the aisle that refuse to do their job to stop spending money we don't have and say, oh, well, what political poll-tested 80-percent-issue can we put out there and go to the American people with so that we can sound reasonable in our demands?

How about you just demand what is right?

Why don't we just stand up and say, you know what? We are going to balance our budget. Giddyup.

That is what every American does. It is what every business has to do. But no, no, no. We will keep going around in circles, each side going to their pet projects.

Meanwhile, the Federal bureaucracy is going to continue to be at war with the American people like my friend, Scott Smith, who was here last night. Not one single mention by the President, hasn't apologized a lick for putting him through that, domestic terrorist.

Hasn't apologized a lick for the fact that his Secretary of Homeland Security, who was here last night, stood up

at a lectern and said that his own border patrol employees that work for him whipped Haitian migrants when he knew full well—both from the video evidence that we all saw with our eyes and a memo from his own people in the Department of Homeland Security—that was not true.

He knew it. And then he blamed it on systemic racism.

Has he apologized? No.

And the reason he hasn't apologized is because he is at war with the people of the United States and the fact that his job is supposed to be to secure the border.

And the President knows it.

The President goes down and does a photo op with a preset visit in El Paso where they literally go out and clean out the streets of the migrants who are piling up in El Paso and sets up a photo op, and then last night dares to come down here, lecture us, lie to the American people that we are trying to go after their Social Security and Medicare, and offer nothing about his constitutional duty as President of the United States to secure the border.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield back here in a minute. I assume my time is running short.

I will just close by saying this: The American people expect more out of the people's House.

They expect more out of the President of the United States than what we saw last night. It was not a State of the Union. It was a state of confusion.

We have an obligation to do our job and stop spending money we don't have, secure the border of the United States, and actually represent the people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 9, 2023, at 9 a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 866. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to achieve parity between the cost-of-living adjustment with respect to an annuity under the Federal Employees Retirement System and an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 867. A bill to establish a commission to redesignate the J. Edgar Hoover F.B.I. Building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GIMENEZ:

H.R. 868. A bill to shorten the review period for the Congressional review of termination of certain national emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 869. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to review whether certain Iranian officials are eligible for entry into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. CLYDE):

H.R. 870. A bill to submit to Congress a report on payments made by the Department of Justice to certain companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 871. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the eligibility of Transportation Security Administration employees to receive public safety officers death benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. COSTA, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 872. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to vest in the Secretary of the Interior functions under that Act with respect to species of fish that spawn in fresh or estuarine waters and migrate to ocean waters and species of fish that spawn in ocean waters and migrate to fresh or estuarine waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 873. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to award grants and contracts for projects that use emerging technologies to address threats to water quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 874. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to allow the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to finance vessel retrofit, repair, or similar work required for the vessel to be a vessel of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAMES:

H.R. 875. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue obligations to make Medicare and Social Security payments, despite the debt limit being reached; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 876. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform certain asylum procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah (for himself and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 877. A bill to change the treatment of certain Federal programs with respect to susceptibility to significant improper payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.R. 878. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to appoint an Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. CARSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 879. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to remove the Andrew Jackson statue and marble base in Lafayette Square in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 880. A bill to establish a program to provide for women's heart health continuing medical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 881. A bill to establish certain protections for a member of the Armed Forces, or a cadet or midshipman at a Federal service academy, who refuses to receive a vaccination against COVID-19; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. DELAURIO, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. CARSON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. BROWN, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILD, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LIEU):

H.R. 882. A bill to provide grants to State educational agencies to support State efforts to increase teacher salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 102. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H. Res. 103. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.